

REMARKS

Claims 11-20 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 11 and 15 are amended and new claim 21 is added.

Specification

The title has been amended to summarize an embodiment of the present invention. No new matter has been added.

The abstract was objected to because it was not written in a single paragraph. The specification has been amended to so that it is written in a single paragraph. No new matter has been added.

The brief description of the drawings has been amended to add a brief description of Fig. 4. No new matter has been added.

The detailed description of the invention has been amended to add reference numerals corresponding to features of the invention specified in the claims and to correct minor informalities. No new matter has been added.

Drawings

The examiner used the drawings found in U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0050382 since the application was filed without drawings. The examiner objected to these drawings as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Figures 1-4 have been submitted as New Sheets. In relation to the drawings found in U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0050382, Fig. 1 has been amended by adding reference numeral 10 to point out the adapter and Fig. 4 has been added to show spring clip 11 and point out rubber lining 12. Support for the amendments to Fig. 3 and additional Fig. 4 can be found throughout the application as filed, for example at page 6, lines 33 – page 7, line 2 and page 8, lines 8-9. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

Referring to the examiner's specific objections, the "adapter" referenced in claims 11 and 14 is shown with reference numeral 10 in Figure 1, the "image display surface" is shown with reference numeral 5 in Figures 3-4, the "metal spring clips" are shown with reference numeral 11 in Figure 4, and the "adhesive joint" is shown with reference numeral 8 in Figure 3. Applicant respectfully traverses the examiner's objection that "displaying a test image on the image display surface, in which the test image is an image combined from n view arranged in rows and/or columns" must be shown in the drawings. The test image, including the step of displaying the test image, does not represent structural detail of the claimed invention. Rather, the test image is a visual result that can be displayed on the image display surface. The only structural feature – the image display surface – is clearly shown as reference numeral 5 in Figures 3-4. Therefore, the step of displaying a test image on the image display surface, in which the test image is an image combined from n view arranged in rows and/or columns, need not be shown in the

drawings. See Ex parte Good, 1911 C.D. 43, 164 O.G. 739 (Comm'r Pat. 1911); MPEP § 608.02(d).

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 11-12, 14-15, and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by WO 2003/034749 A1 to Tung, et al. ("Tung"). To the extent that the rejections apply to the amended claims, the rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below.

Amended claim 11 recites removing the front bezel from the 2D display screen. The Office Action asserts that the spring-clip based mounting apparatus with removable spring handles disclosed on page 4, lines 1-3 of Tung anticipates the step of removing a bezel from a 2D display screen recited in claim 11. Neither this disclosure nor any other disclosure in Tung, however, teaches or suggests removing a bezel. Referring to Figure 3 of Tung, the removable spring handles 306, removable adjustment grip 308, and display bezel (no reference shown) are represented as separate structures in the invention. Referring to Figure 2, the attachment and alignment process flow diagram illustrates the step of "remove grips" (reference numeral 214). Although Tung may disclose spring handles and grips that can be removed, Tung does not teach or suggest the removal of the display bezel depicted in Figures 3-5. In fact, the use of a spring clip 302, compression-screw attachment clip 500, or spring-clip device 402 with a thumbscrew

402 as disclosed by Tung for retaining a stereoscopic enabling device 304, 406, 504 would require that the bezel remain in place so that the 2D display screen cannot be disturbed.

Amended claim 15 recites a frame that is positionable intermediate a front pane and a chassis. The Office Action asserts that the removable spring handles disclosed in Figure 3 as reference numeral 306 anticipate a frame. Neither this disclosure nor any other disclosure in Tung, however, anticipates a frame that is positionable intermediate a front pane and a chassis. Rather, Tung discloses a spring clip attachment 302 with removable spring handles 306, a spring clip attachment 402 with a thumb screw pressure adjustment 404, and a screw clip attachment 500 with a thumb screw that are positionable *over* a 2D display device, as depicted in Figures 3-5. In fact, Tung teaches away from the removable spring handles of the spring clip attachment being positionable intermediate a front pane and a chassis, providing at page 4, lines 7-9, that “[a]nother feature of this spring clip is that it extends from the backside of the display, over the top of the display and across the display bezel to the SED.”

Therefore, claims 11 and 15 are allowable. Claims 12-14 depend from claim 11 and claims 16-20 depend from claim 15 and are also allowable. The rejections of claims 12-14 and claims 16-20 are traversed but not expressly argued in view of the allowability of the underlying base claim.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 16 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tung in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,046,849 to Moseley (“Moseley”). To the extent that the rejections apply to the amended claims, the rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below.

Claims 16 and 20 depend from amended independent claim 15 and are allowable for the same reasons as previously set forth in relation to amended independent claim 15. The Examiner cited Moseley for teaching a front pane comprising shatter resistant glass and a planar, electrically conductive structure that shields observers from electromagnetic radiation and teaching an optical structure comprising a wavelength filter array laminated to or printed on the front pane. Moseley, however, does not make up for the previously noted deficiencies of Tung in relation to claim 15. Specifically, Moseley does not teach or suggest a frame defining a geometric extension parallel to the image display surface approximately equal to an extension of the front bezel of the 2D display screen. Therefore, claims 16 and 20, which depend from claim 15, are not unpatentable over Tung in view of Moseley.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claim 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 13 depends from independent claim 11. New independent claim 21 has been added. Claim 21 includes the limitations of claim 13 rewritten to include all of the limitations of previously presented claim 11. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow new independent claim 21.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas J. Christensen
Registration No. 35,480

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thunte, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 349-3001